arXiv:1701.00727v1 [math.DS] 2 Jan 2017

State-Space Representation of Hysteresis Systems Exhibiting the Return Point Memory

S.E.Langvagen*

Chernogolovka, Moscow Region

December 30, 2016

Abstract

Application of the minimal state-space realization to hysteresis systems is studied. The method allows to construct the space of states and establish the state transition rules using the *input equivalence*, which can be obtained for hysteresis systems basing on rate independence and the return point memory.

Contents

1 Introduction 1
2 Rate Independence and the Return Point Memory 2
3 Reachability of Demagnetized State 4
4 The Space of States and the State Transition Rules 5
5 Read-Out Functions 7
6 Transformations of the State Variables 11
7 Algebraic Properties of Read-Out Functions 13
8 Relation to the Preisach model 14
9 Conclusions 16
A Appendix: State-Space of the Input-Output Systems 18

1 Introduction

The science of hysteresis is a science about systems that demonstrate similar external behavior, but can have a very different internal structure. Hysteresis is observed in magnetism, elastoplasticity, ferroelectricity, superconductivity, and other branches of science [2].

For hysteresis systems, the current output depends on the previous history of the input,

$$y(t') = \mathcal{W}[u](t'), \quad t' \in [t_0, t], \tag{1.1}$$

where u and y are input and output functions of time t'; $\mathcal{W}$ is called hysteresis operator. Currently the most common and efficient approach to mathematical description of hysteresis uses the models based on the ensembles of simple hysteresis operators like relay operator, play operator or stop operator [3, 7, 10, 15].

This work studies application of the method known in system theory as "minimal state-space realization" to the hysteresis systems. The method does not use the decomposition of hysteresis operator or modeling the internal structure of the system.

The minimal realization is outlined in [16] as the "realization that is obtained by considering as the state at time t the equivalence class of those inputs up to time t which yield the same output after the time t

*Electronic address: sergey.langwagen@gmail.com

regardless of how the input is continued after time t". The minimal state-space realization has applications in control theory of linear systems [12]. In finite automata theory, the similar notion is known as the Nerode equivalence [6]. The idea to label metastable states of hysteresis systems by the field history was proposed in [17].

Let $x(t)$ be a state of the system at time t, as it is defined for the minimal realization. Then, instead of (1.1), we have

$$y(t) = f(x(t), u(t)), \tag{1.2}$$

where the output y, the input u, and the state x are taken at the same time instance t; f is called *read-out function* [16]. The state x comprises information about the previous history. The subsequent behavior of the system is the same for inputs that belong to the same equivalence class. Thus, we can select in each equivalence class one representative input and use these inputs to introduce coordinates in the space of states. If any input that belongs to a class $x(t)$ is prolonged up to a time instance $t + s$, the new input belongs to the equivalence class $x(t + s)$, which depends on $x(t)$ and on the input u in the time interval tween t and $t + s$. If we know the coordinates of the old state, we can get the coordinates of the new state, i.e., the input equivalence determines the state transition law (see Appendix A).

The representation of states as the equivalence classes is well suited for hysteresis systems, because the needed equivalence relation can be determined by two well known characteristic properties of hysteresis — the rate independence and the return point memory, also known as wiping out [1, 3, 10, 15]. In this article, the consideration is restricted to the magnetic hysteresis in order to include the demagnetized state into the scope.

2 Rate Independence and the Return Point Memory

Consider the behavior of a hysteresis system under slow varying inputs $H(t')$, $t_0 \le t' \le t$, where H is the magnetizing field; beginning and end times t_0 and t may differ for different inputs. Let the experiments be performed as follows:

(i) The system is put into the demagnetized state before the beginning of each experiment t_0;

(ii) Admissible inputs $\mathcal{U}^*$ are continuous piecewise-linear functions of time $H(t')$, $t' \in (-\infty, t]$, with a finite number of segments. It is assumed that $H(t') = 0$ before t_0, and $|H(t')| \le H_{max}$ for all inputs;

(iii) A set Y of output variables is selected. During each experiment, the variables included in this set are measured.

For the simplicity, only one output variable y will be considered, which can be any variable in Y. It seems to be reasonable to expect that y can represent not only the magnetization M but also other macroscopic characteristics of the system, such as magnetostrictive deformation and tension, thermodynamic properties, e.g., free energy, etc.

Let us denote by H^t the input $H(t')$ with the end time t. The input H^{t+s}, $s \ge 0$, is called *prolongation* of the input H^t if $H^{t+s}(t') = H^t(t')$ for all $t' \in (-\infty, t]$.

It must be clear that, if the final values of the inputs H_1^t, $H_2^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$ are equal then for any prolongation H_1^{t+s} of H_1^t there exists a prolongation of the input H_2^t such that $H_1^{t+s}(t') = H_2^{t+s}(t')$ for all $t' \in [t, t + s]$. The inputs $H_1^{t_1}$, $H_2^{t_2} \in \mathcal{U}^*$ that have the same final value of H can be compared in the following way (cf. Definitions A.2, A.4):

(i) Shift any of the inputs $H_1^{t_1}$, $H_2^{t_2}$ along the time axis, making the end times equal. Denote the shifted inputs by H_1^t, H_2^t;

(ii) Consider "equal" prolongations H_1^{t+s}, H_2^{t+s} such that $H_1^{t+s}(t') = H_2^{t+s}(t')$ for all $t' \in [t, t + s]$, and compare the outputs $y_1^{t+s}(t')$, $y_2^{t+s}(t')$ in the time interval $[t, t + s]$;

(iii) If $y_1^{t+s}(t') = y_2^{t+s}(t')$ for all $t' \in [t, t + s]$ and for any "equal" prolongations $H_1^{t+s}(t'), H_2^{t+s}(t')$ then we say that the inputs $H_1^{t_1}$, $H_2^{t_2}$ are equivalent and write $H_1^{t_1} \sim H_2^{t_2}$.

The inputs that have different final values of H, i.e., such that $H_1^{t_1}(t_1) \neq H_2^{t_2}(t_2)$, can not be compared and hence can not be equivalent. The equivalence relation introduced above is the binary equivalence relation (see Proposition A.1). Hence, it partitions the set of admissible inputs into equivalence classes.

In the sequel, we understand the term "state" as the class of equivalent inputs, using as interchangeable the terms "the inputs are equivalent", "the final states of the inputs are the same", "the inputs belong to the same state".

Lemma 2.1. *Let H_1^{t+s}, H_2^{t+s} be prolongations of equivalent inputs $H_1^t \sim H_2^t$. If $H_1^{t+s}(t') = H_2^{t+s}(t')$ for all $t' \in [t, t+s]$, then $H_1^{t+s} \sim H_2^{t+s}$.*

Proof. The statement obviously follows from the above definition of equivalent inputs (cf. Lemma A.3). □

For the piecewise-linear inputs $H^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$, the *rate independence* of the hysteresis system can be described as follows. If the input changes linearly from the initial demagnetized state, the final state depends on the final value of H and does not depend on the slope. The same is true for the second segment of the input, and so on. This means that the following proposition holds true:

Proposition 2.1. *For rate-independent systems any input $H^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$ is equivalent to the piecewise-linear input $\tilde{H}^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$ with positive and negative slopes alternating after t_0. Inputs that have the same sequences of local maxima and minima are equivalent.*

The other remarkable property typical to many hysteresis systems is the return point memory (RPM), which is often considered as a property of the Preisach model. Using compact definition given in [14], RPM can be expressed in terms of the input equivalence; in this form RPM is completely independent of any hysteresis model and can be considered as a property of the hysteresis operator (1.1), or as a description of the experimental behavior of the system. This behavior is essentially the same as expressed by the Madelung rules, noticed over a century ago [9], see also [3]. The return point memory is not precise due to the so-called accommodation [1], but, in many cases, the disagreements can be considered as not very significant. The definition given in [14] is presented below in a slightly changed form as a proposition.



Figure 2.1: The state at point O is the demagnetized state. According to Proposition 2.3, the input equivalence can be represented as follows: $OMAB \sim OMAC \sim OMAD$, $ONAB \sim ONAC \sim ONAD$, and $OMAB' \sim OMAC'$, $ONAB' \sim ONAC'$. If $OMA \sim ONA$, then, due to Lemma 2.1, $OMAB \sim OMAC \sim OMAD \sim ONAB \sim ONAC \sim ONAD$ and $OMAB' \sim OMAC' \sim ONAB' \sim ONAC'$. The states at points B, C, D are the same for any fixed state at point A. The same is true for the states at points B', C'. The states at points A, A' are different in a general case.

Proposition 2.2 (*Return point memory*)**.** *Let the system is evolved from state $x(t_1)$ under the field $H(t')$, $t' \in [t_1, t_2]$, and $H(t_1) = H_1$. Then the state $x(t_2)$ depends only on the field $H(t_2) = H_2$, regardless of how the field $H(t')$ changed, provided that $H(t') \in [H_1, H_2]$ for all $t' \in [t_1, t_2]$.*

Interpreting the states as the equivalence classes and taking into account Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.1, we can reformulate the Proposition 2.2 in terms of the equivalent inputs.

Proposition 2.3 (*RPM in terms of the input equivalence*). *Let input* $H^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$, $H^t(t) = H_1$, *be prolonged in two different ways by inputs* $H_1^{t+s_1}$, $H_2^{t+s_2}$, *such that* $H_1^{t+s_1}(t+s_1) = H_2^{t+s_2}(t+s_2) = H_2$. *If* $H_1^{t+s_1}(t') \in [H_1, H_2]$ *for all* $t' \in [t, t+s_1]$ *and* $H_2^{t+s_2}(t') \in [H_1, H_2]$ *for all* $t' \in [t, t+s_2]$, *then* $H_1^{t+s_1} \sim H_2^{t+s_2}$.

In Propositions 2.2, 2.3, $[H_1, H_2]$ denotes $[min\{H_1, H_2\}, max\{H_1, H_2\}]$.

Definition 2.1. We say that the system *exhibits RPM* if Proposition 2.3 holds true.

The return point memory is illustrated by Fig 2.1. For the input $OMACD$ or $ONACD$, the states at points C and D are the same, and part CD of the input can be omitted, because it does not influence the final state. Using the terminology of [3], removing of the redundant part from the history $H(t)$ will be called the *Madelung deletion*.

3 Reachability of Demagnetized State

Demagnetized state is the state obtained by applying oscillating field of amplitude slowly decreasing from a large initial value H_m to zero [1], as illustrated by Fig. 3.1. The demagnetization must be *symmetric*, i.e., all the successive turning points, such as points A and B, must have the same or approximately the same absolute value of the field H. "Slowly decreasing" means that the amplitudes of adjacent cycles differs by a small value ε. For the simplicity, it is assumed that ε is constant during the demagnetization. The value of the output y in the demagnetized state O' is the limiting value at the end point of the demagnetization process as $\varepsilon \to 0$.



Figure 3.1: The demagnetized state O' is obtained by the demagnetization process OO' as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Inputs $O'A_1$ and $O'B_1$ correspond to the descending and ascending initial magnetization curves respectively. The equivalent inputs are: $O'B_1 \sim O'B_2 \sim O'A_1B_3$ and $O'A_1 \sim O'A_2$.

Definition 3.1. Let us say that the *demagnetized state is reachable*, if the state obtained by the described above demagnetization process, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, is indistinguishable from the initial demagnetized state.

Applying Proposition 2.3 to the input OA and prolongations OAB, $OABO'B_1$, $OABO'B_2$, $OABO'A_1B_3$ (Fig. 3.1), it can be seen that $OAB \sim OABO'B_1 \sim OABO'B_2 \sim OABO'A_1B_3$, i.e., the states at points B, B_1, B_2, B_3 are the same. In the similar way, examining the input OB' and prolongations $OB'A$, $OB'AO'A_1$, $OB'AO'A_2$, it can be found that the states at points A, A_1, A_2 are the same. Considering the state at point O' as the initial demagnetized state, we can write $O'B_1 \sim O'B_2 \sim O'A_1B_3$ and $O'A_1 \sim O'A_2$. Similar results can be obtained for any input that starts from the point O' and lays inside the region $[-\Delta H, \Delta H]$. This gives the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let the system exhibits RPM and has reachable demagnetized state. If the system is put into the demagnetized sate at the time* t_0, $H^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$, *and* $H^t(t') \in [-\Delta H, \Delta H]$ *for all* $t' \in [t_0, t]$, *then all* H^t, *such that* $H^t(t) = \Delta H$ *are equivalent, and all* H^t, *such that* $H^t(t) = -\Delta H$, *are equivalent.*

Corollary 3.0.1. *The state obtained from the demagnetized state after increasing (decreasing) the field by ΔH can also be reached from the demagnetized state via decreasing (increasing) the field by ΔH and then increasing (decreasing) it by $2\Delta H$.*

Starting from the demagnetized state O, we can return back to this state, e.g., decreasing the field by the value ΔH, not necessary large, and then performing the demagnetization process AO' (Figure 3.2). In this way we merely continue the previous demagnetization performed with a large initial amplitude.

If the system has the reachable demagnetized state according to Definition 3.1, then, for sufficiently small ε, the states O and O' can be considered as identical. Thus, the output y at the end of any input applied to the state O', as $\varepsilon \to 0$, must tend to the value y at the end of the same input applied directly to the state O. As an example, the value y at the end point of input $OAO'B'CD$ must tend to the value y at end point of input $OB'CD$.

Consider the input $OABO'B'$. The states at points B, B', as it was shown before, are the same. Because of this, the part $BO'B'$ can be omitted, which means that $OABCD \sim OAO'B'CD$, i.e., the input with "full" demagnetization AO' can be replaced by the input with "partial" demagnetization AB. Thus, the output y at the end of the input $OABCD$ must tend to the output at the end of the input $OB'CD$, as $\varepsilon \to 0$. The condition of this kind allows to impose on the read-out functions the restriction that expresses the reachability of demagnetized state (see Section 5 later on).



Figure 3.2: Inputs $OAO'B'CD$ and $OABCD$ are equivalent. As $\varepsilon \to 0$, the output value y at the end of input $OABCD$ must tend to the value y at the end of input $OB'CD$.

4 The Space of States and the State Transition Rules

According to Proposition 2.1, the inputs $\tilde{H}^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$ that have the same sequence of local maxima and minima $\tilde{H}_0\tilde{H}_1 \dots \tilde{H}_k$ are equivalent. We can reduce the number of elements in the sequence by replacing successively the inputs with equivalent ones as follows. Let $\tilde{H}_{i_0}$ be the element in the sequence that has the maximum absolute value, or, if there are more than one such element, the last one. Assume at first that $\tilde{H}_{i_0} < 0$ and let $H_0 = \tilde{H}_{i_0}$. As follows from Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 2.1, $\tilde{H}_0\tilde{H}_1 \dots \tilde{H}_k \sim H_0\tilde{H}_{i_0+1}\tilde{H}_{i_0+2} \dots \tilde{H}_k$. Let $\tilde{H}_{i_1} = H_1$ be the last maximal element in the sequence $\tilde{H}_{i+1}\tilde{H}_{i+2} \dots \tilde{H}_k$. According to Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.1, $\tilde{H}_0\tilde{H}_1 \dots \tilde{H}_k \sim H_0H_1\tilde{H}_{i_1+1}\tilde{H}_{i_1+2} \dots \tilde{H}_k$. In the similar way we have $\tilde{H}_0\tilde{H}_1 \dots \tilde{H}_k \sim H_0H_1H_2\tilde{H}_{i_2+1}\tilde{H}_{i_2+2} \dots \tilde{H}_k$, where $\tilde{H}_{i_2} = H_2$ is the last minimal element in the sequence $\tilde{H}_{i_1+1}\tilde{H}_{i_1+2} \dots \tilde{H}_k$. Selecting maximum and minimum elements alternatively, we end up with the *reduced memory sequence* [15] $H_0H_1H_2 \dots H_n$ that is equivalent to the initial input $\tilde{H}_0\tilde{H}_1 \dots \tilde{H}_k$.

In the case $\tilde{H}_{i_0} > 0$, let $H_0 = -\tilde{H}_{i_0}$ and $H_1 = \tilde{H}_{i_0}$. Taking into account Corollary 3.0.1, we have $\tilde{H}_0\tilde{H}_1 \dots \tilde{H}_k \sim H_0H_1\tilde{H}_{i_0+1}\tilde{H}_{i_0+2} \dots \tilde{H}_k$. Now the remaining elements in the sequence can be defined as before, getting the reduced memory sequence $\tilde{H}_0\tilde{H}_1 \dots \tilde{H}_k \sim H_0H_1 \dots H_n$ with $H_0 < 0$. In this way, we excluded the sequences with different signs of H_0.

The last case, $\tilde{H}_{i_0} = 0$, corresponds to the trivial input, such that $\tilde{H}^t(t') = 0$ for all $t' \in (-\infty, t]$, and to the reduced memory sequence with $n = 0$ and $H_0 = 0$.

The results of the above consideration can be represented as the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *For systems that exhibit RPM and have reachable demagnetized state, any input $\tilde{H}^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$ is equivalent to the input $H^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$ determined by the reduced memory sequence $H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_n$, with $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, such that*

$$-H_{max} \le H_0 \le 0, \quad H_1 \le |H_0|, \quad H_0 < H_2 < H_4 \ldots, \quad H_1 > H_3 > H_5 \ldots, \quad H = H_n, \tag{4.1}$$

where $H_1, H_3, H_5, \ldots$ are local maxima and $H_0, H_2, H_4, \ldots$ are local minima of the input H^t.

Because the input equivalence is transitive, all the inputs that are equivalent to the input $H_0 H_1 \ldots H_n$ are equivalent to each other. Thus, the variables $H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_n$ determine the class of equivalent inputs, i.e., the state of the system. This means that the reduced memory sequences $H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_n$ with $H_0 \le 0$ and $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, represent coordinates in the state-space of a system that exhibits RPM and has the reachable demagnetized state according to Definitions 2.1, 3.1.

As usual, different coordinate systems can be used for parametrization of the state-space. Consider another coordinates introduced below, which seem to be more convenient to represent the read-out functions. Let us define

$$\Delta H_0 = |H_0|, \ \Delta H_1 = |H_1 - H_0|, \ \ldots \ , \ \Delta H_n = |H_n - H_{n-1}|. \tag{4.2}$$

Lemma 4.2. *Any input $\tilde{H}^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$ is equivalent to the input $H^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$ such that, starting from the demagnetized state at $H = 0$, the field linearly decreases by the value ΔH_0, then increases by ΔH_1 then decreases by ΔH_2, and so on till ΔH_n, where $n = 0, 1, 2 \ldots$ and*

$$2H_{max} \ge 2\Delta H_0 \ge \Delta H_1 > \Delta H_2 > \ldots > \Delta H_n > 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. Omitted. □

Any state reachable from the demagnetized state, can be obtained by the input $\Delta H_0 \Delta H_1 \ldots \Delta H_n$ according to Lemma 4.2. To shorten the notations, let us introduce the variables $\xi_0, \xi_1 \ldots, \xi_n$,

$$\xi_0 = 2\Delta H_0, \ \xi_1 = \Delta H_1, \ \xi_2 = \Delta H_2, \ \ldots, \ \xi_n = \Delta H_n. \tag{4.4}$$

It is convenient to accept instead of (4.3) less strict inequalities

$$\xi_M \ge \xi_0 \ge \xi_1 \ge \xi_2 \ge \ldots \ge \xi_n \ge 0, \quad \text{where} \quad \xi_M/2 = H_{max}. \tag{4.5}$$

Taking into account that the signs of $H_i - H_{i-1}$ are alternating in (4.2), the reduced memory sequence $H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_n$ can be expressed via $\xi_0, \xi_1 \ldots, \xi_n$ as follows:

$$H_k = -\frac{1}{2}\xi_0 + \xi_1 - \ldots \pm \xi_k, \quad \text{where} \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \ n, \tag{4.6}$$

and for the field H we have

$$H = -\frac{1}{2}\xi_0 + \xi_1 - \ldots \pm \xi_n. \tag{4.7}$$

The equations (4.6) determine a linear reversible transformation between variables $\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n$ and $H_0, \ldots, H_n$, which means that $\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n$ are equally acceptable as coordinates as the reduced memory sequences $H_0, \ldots, H_n$.

In the coordinates $\xi_0, \xi_1 \ldots, \xi_n$, the demagnetized state is (0). The hysteresis branch that corresponds to ξ_n is ascending for odd n and descending for even n. The state $(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{n-1}, 0)$ is obviously the same as the state $(\xi_0, , \ldots, \xi_{n-1})$. If $\xi_i = \xi_{i+1}$ and $1 \le i \le n-1$, the state $(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_n)$ is the same as the state $(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+2}, \ldots \xi_n)$ according to Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.1. Excluding equal adjacent coordinates corresponds to the *Madelung deletion* mentioned in the previous section.

Let us examine how the state variables evolve when the input changes (cf. Propositions A.2, A.3). Let H increases or decreases by the small value δH, not violating the inequalities (4.5).

From the initial demagnetized state (0) we can go along the descending or ascending magnetization curves, and the new state will be $(2|\delta H|)$ if $\delta H < 0$ or $(2\delta H, 2\delta H)$ if $\delta H > 0$.

The state (ξ_0, ξ_0) is the state on the ascending magnetization curve with $H = \xi_0/2$. If $\delta H > 0$, the new state is on the same curve with $H = \xi_0/2 + \delta H$, which is the state $(\xi_0 + 2\delta H, \xi_0 + 2\delta H)$.

For other states $(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n)$ with odd n, if $\delta H < 0$, the variable $\xi_{n+1} = |\delta H|$ is added, because $H(t)$ starts to decrease after increasing. Otherwise, if $\delta H > 0$, $H(t)$ continues increasing, and the new state is $(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n + \delta H)$. The similar is true for even n, with opposite signs of δH.

Due to the Madelung deletion that must be performed if ξ_n becomes equal to ξ_{n-1} for $n \geq 2$, the inequalities (4.3) remain true.

The following proposition summarizes the above results.

Proposition 4.1. *The sequences of variables $\xi_0, \xi_1 \dots, \xi_n$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$, defined according (4.4), (4.5), can be accepted as coordinates in the state-space of a system that exhibits RPM and has reachable demagnetized state. When H changes, the coordinates of the the state change according to Table 4.1.*

Table 4.1: State Transition Rules

Current Sate	**New state**	
	$\delta H > 0$	$\delta H < 0$
(0)	$(2\delta H, 2\delta H)$	$(2\|\delta H\|)$
(ξ_0, ξ_0)	$(\xi_0 + 2\delta H, \xi_0 + 2\delta H)$	$(\xi_0, \xi_0, \|\delta H\|)$
$(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n)$, n even	$(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n, \delta H)$	$(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n + \|\delta H\|)$
$(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n)$, n odd	$(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n + \delta H)$	$(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n, \|\delta H\|)$

Notes:

(i) δH must be small enough for the new state to be in agreement with (4.5).

(ii) If ξ_n becomes equal to ξ_{n-1}, $n \geq 2$, the new state will be $(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{n-2})$.

5 Read-Out Functions

For a system that exhibits RPM and has reachable demagnetized state, any output value y that depends on the state of the system can be expressed as a sequence of functions

$$y_n(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n), \quad \text{where} \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, \tag{5.1}$$

defined on the region $D_n(\xi_M)$ determined by inequalities (4.5). Note that the input H does not need to be an argument of the read-out functions (5.1) due to (4.7), cf. (1.2). According to (4.4), the coordinates $\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n$ describe how a given state can be obtained from the initial demagnetized state. As a matter of fact, functions (5.1) represent multiple order reversal curves in the H-y plane with $n + 1$ branches.

We further restrict the consideration to systems that exhibit smooth multiple order reversal curves, assuming that $y_n(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n)$ are sufficiently many times differentiable on $D_n(\xi_M)$ and have partial derivatives uniformly bounded with respect to n:

$$\left| \frac{\partial^k y_n}{\partial^{k_0}\xi_0, \dots, \partial^{k_n}\xi_n} \right| \leq C_k, \text{ where} \quad k = k_0 + \dots + k_n. \tag{5.2}$$

Actually (5.2) will be used for $k \le 2$ only.

As mentioned above, the magnetization M and probably some other macroscopic physical values, such as thermodynamic potentials, magnetostrictive deformation, etc., can be expressed by (5.1).

Let us consider conditions that must be imposed on functions $y_n(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n)$. The initial point of $(n+1)$-th hysteresis branch is the final point of n-th branch, which gives the following condition:

(Y0) $y_n(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = y_{n-1}(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1})$, if $\xi_n = 0$, $n \ge 1$.

When $\xi_k = \xi_{k+1}$, the Madelung deletion can be applied, thus, we have

(Y1) $y_n(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_k, \xi_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_n) = y_{n-2}(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{k-1}, \xi_{k+2}, \dots, \xi_n)$,
if $\xi_k = \xi_{k+1}$, $1 \le k \le n-1$, $n \ge 2$.

Lemma 5.1. *The* **(Y1)** *condition has the equivalent form*

$$\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_k} + \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_{k+1}} = 0, \quad \text{if } \xi_k = \xi_{k+1},\ 1 \le k \le n-1. \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. Obviously, (5.3) follows from **(Y1)**. Let us prove that (5.3) implies **(Y1)**. When the adjacent pair of equal coordinates changes, y_n does not changes due to (5.3). If the pair of equal coordinates in the left side of **(Y1)** is not the last one, we may decrease $\xi_k = \xi_{k+1}$ until $\xi_k = \xi_{k+1} = \xi_{k+2}$, then decrease the pair $\xi_{k+1} = \xi_{k+2}$ in the same way, and so on. Eventually we get $\xi_{n-1} = \xi_n$. Making this pair equal to zero and using **(Y0)** twice gives the right side of **(Y1)**. □

Lemma 5.2. *The inequality*

$$\left| \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_i} + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_{i+k}} \right| \le C_2 \cdot (\xi_i - \xi_{i+k}) \tag{5.4}$$

holds for for any $i \ge 1$, $k \ge 1$, such that $1 \le i + k \le n$.

Proof. Taking into account Lemma 5.1 and (5.2) we can write

$$\left| \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_i} + \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_{i+1}} \right| \le C_2 \cdot (\xi_i - \xi_{i+1}). \tag{5.5}$$

The absolute value

$$\left| \left(\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_i} + \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_{i+1}} \right) - \left(\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_{i+1}} + \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_{i+2}} \right) + \dots + (-1)^{k+1} \left(\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_{i+k-1}} + \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_{i+k}} \right) \right|$$

equals to the left side of (5.4), and, as follows from (5.5), is not greater than $C_2 \cdot (\xi_i - \xi_{i+k})$. □

Conditions **(Y0)**, **(Y1)** do not guarantee, e.g, that after the demagnetization process the output value y will be the same as in the initial demagnetized state. The output y at the end of any input applied to the state O' obtained after the demagnetization, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, must tend to the output y after applying the same input to the initial demagnetized sate O (see Figure 3.2). If this is true, we can say that the demagnetized state is reachable. Taking into account that the "full" demagnetization can be replaced by the "partial" demagnetization, as described in Section 3, the sufficient and necessary condition for the reachability of demagnetized state can be written as follows:

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} y_{n+2N}(\xi_0, \xi_0 - \varepsilon, \xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \dots, \xi_0 - 2N\varepsilon, \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n) = y_n(\tilde{\xi}_0, \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n), \tag{5.6}$$

where $\varepsilon = (\xi_0 - \tilde{\xi}_0)/2N$, and the variables $\tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n$ correspond to an arbitrary process performed after the "partial" demagnetization.

Let us consider the following condition:

(Y2) $2\dfrac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_0} + \dfrac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_1} = 0$, if $\xi_0 = \xi_1$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$.

Lemma 5.3. *Condition* **(Y2)** *implies*

$$y_n(\xi_0, \xi_0 - \varepsilon, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) = y_n(\xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) + O(\varepsilon^2), \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0,$$

where the estimate $O(\varepsilon^2)$ *does not depend on* n.

Proof. From the Taylor's theorem we have

$$y_n(\xi_0, \xi_0 - \varepsilon, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) = y_n(\xi_0, \xi_0, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) - \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_1} \cdot \varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2),$$
$$y_n(\xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) = y_n(\xi_0, \xi_0, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) - \left(\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_0} + \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_1}\right) \cdot 2\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2),$$

where the estimate $O(\varepsilon^2)$ does not depend on n due to (5.2). Subtracting one equation from the other and using **(Y2)** gives the statement of the lemma. □

Lemma 5.4. *Condition* **(Y2)** *implies that after the demagnetization the output value* y *returns to its value in the initial demagnetized state as follows:*

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} y_{2N}(\xi_0, \xi_0 - \varepsilon, \xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \dots, \xi_0 - 2N\varepsilon) = y_0(0), \tag{5.7}$$

where $\varepsilon = \xi_0/(2N+1)$, *and* N *denotes the number of demagnetization cycles.*

Proof. The left side of (5.7) can be transformed to

$$y_{2N}(\xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \dots, \xi_0 - 2N\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

by using Lemma 5.3. Applying the Madelung deletion **(Y1)** to the second and third arguments gives

$$y_{2N-2}(\xi_0 - 2\varepsilon, \xi_0 - 3\varepsilon, \dots, \xi_0 - 2N\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^2).$$

By repeating the same steps N times, finally we get

$$y_n(\xi_0 - 2N\varepsilon) + N \cdot O(\varepsilon^2) = y_n(\varepsilon) + N \cdot O(\varepsilon^2) \to y_0(0),$$

taking into account that $\varepsilon = \xi_0/(2N+1)$. □

Proposition 5.1. *Condition* **(Y2)** *is necessary and sufficient for the reachability of demagnetized state according to (5.6) .*

Proof. The proof that **(Y2)** implies (5.6) is almost the same as the proof of Lemma 5.4 and is omitted. Let us prove that (5.6) implies **(Y2)**. Rewrite the left side of (5.6) as follows:

$$y_{n+2N}(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{2N}, \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n), \tag{5.8}$$

where

$$\xi_0 - \xi_1 = \xi_1 - \xi_2 = \ldots = \xi_{2N-1} - \xi_{2N} = \frac{\Delta\xi}{2N} = \varepsilon, \ \Delta\xi = \xi_0 - \tilde{\xi}_0.$$

Let us replace in (5.8) the arguments ξ_i having odd indexes by $\xi_i - \theta\varepsilon$ and consider the result as the function of θ

$$y(\theta) = y_{n+2N}(\xi_0, \xi_1 - \theta\varepsilon, \xi_2, \xi_3 - \theta\varepsilon, \dots, \xi_{2N-1} - \theta\varepsilon, \xi_{2N}, \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n). \tag{5.9}$$

Note that $y(0)$ equals to (5.8), and $y(1) = y_n(\tilde{\xi}_0 + \Delta\xi, \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots \tilde{\xi}_n)$ due to the Madelung deletion of the adjacent arguments ξ_i. Applying the Taylor's theorem to $y(\theta)$ gives

$$y_n(\tilde{\xi}_0 + \Delta\xi, \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n) = y_{n+2N}(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{2N}, \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n)$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial y_{n+2N}}{\partial \xi_{2i-1}} \cdot \frac{\Delta\xi}{2N} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \frac{\partial^2 y_{n+2N}}{\partial \xi_{2i-1} \partial \xi_{2j-1}} \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta\xi}{2N}\right)^2. \tag{5.10}$$

Similarly, for the derivative $\partial y(\theta)/\partial\tilde{\xi}_1$

$$\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial\tilde{\xi}_1} = \frac{\partial y_{n+2N}}{\partial\tilde{\xi}_1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial^2 y_{n+2N}}{\partial\tilde{\xi}_1\partial\xi_{2i-1}} \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta\xi}{2N}\right). \tag{5.11}$$

In (5.10) and (5.11) the second derivatives are taken at some point $\theta \in [0,1]$.

If $\tilde{\xi}_0 = \tilde{\xi}_1$ then $\xi_{2i-1} \in [\tilde{\xi}_1 + \Delta\xi, \tilde{\xi}_1]$, and from Lemma 5.2

$$\frac{\partial y_{n+2N}}{\partial\xi_{2i-1}} = \frac{\partial y_{n+2N}}{\partial\tilde{\xi}_1} + O(\Delta\xi), \text{ if } \tilde{\xi}_0 = \tilde{\xi}_1. \tag{5.12}$$

From the boundedness of the derivatives (5.2) follows that the last term in (5.11) is $O(\Delta\xi)$. Combining (5.11), (5.12) gives

$$\frac{\partial y_{n+2N}}{\partial\xi_{2i-1}} = \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial\tilde{\xi}_1} + O(\Delta\xi), \text{ if } \tilde{\xi}_0 = \tilde{\xi}_1. \tag{5.13}$$

The estimate $O(\Delta\xi)$ in (5.11), (5.12), and hence in (5.13), does not depend on N. Note that the last term in (5.10) is of $O(\Delta\xi^2)$ order and does not depend on N also, because the number of terms in the double sum is N^2. After substituting (5.13) into (5.10) we get

$$y_{n+2N}(\xi_0,\xi_1,\dots,\xi_{2N},\tilde{\xi}_1,\dots,\tilde{\xi}_n) = y_n(\tilde{\xi}_0+\Delta\xi,\tilde{\xi}_1,\dots\tilde{\xi}_n) + \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial\tilde{\xi}_1}\cdot\frac{\Delta\xi}{2} + O(\Delta\xi^2), \text{ if } \tilde{\xi}_0 = \tilde{\xi}_1.$$

Here the right side including the estimate $O(\Delta\xi^2)$ does not depend on N. Due to the reachability of the demagnetized state according to (5.6), the right side tends to $y_n(\tilde{\xi}_0,\dots,\tilde{\xi}_n)$, as $N\to\infty$. Therefore, we have

$$y_n(\tilde{\xi}_0,\dots,\tilde{\xi}_n) = y_n(\tilde{\xi}_0+\Delta\xi,\tilde{\xi}_1,\dots,\tilde{\xi}_n) + \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial\tilde{\xi}_1}\cdot\frac{\Delta\xi}{2} + O(\Delta\xi^2), \text{ if } \tilde{\xi}_0 = \tilde{\xi}_1.$$

Dividing the last equation by $\Delta\xi$ and taking the limit $\Delta\xi\to 0$ gives **(Y2)**. □

To understand what condition **(Y2)** means in terms of hysteresis curves in the H-y plane, let us consider two states: (ξ_0,ξ_0), which is the state on the ascending initial magnetization curve, and (ξ_0,ξ_1), which is the state on the ascending branch of the symmetric cycle. After the magnetic field increases by $\delta H > 0$, the first and the second states will be $(\xi_0+2\delta H, 2\xi_0+2\delta H)$ and $(\xi_0,\xi_1+\delta H)$ respectively (see Table 4.1). Calculating derivatives with respect to δH we get in the first and the second cases:

$$\frac{d}{d(\delta H)}y_1(\xi_0+2\delta H,\xi_0+2\delta H) = 2\frac{\partial y_1}{\partial\xi_0} + 2\frac{\partial y_1}{\partial\xi_1}, \qquad \frac{d}{d(\delta H)}y_1(\xi_0,\xi_1+\delta H) = \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial\xi_1}.$$

If $\xi_1\to\xi_0$, two curves meet each other and, as follows from **(Y2)**, are tangent at this point.

Condition **(Y1)** can be expressed in the form similar to **(Y2)** according to Lemma 5.1. Both conditions can be combined in one

(Y1*) $\quad 2^{\delta_{0i}}\dfrac{\partial y_n}{\partial\xi_i} + \dfrac{\partial y_n}{\partial\xi_{i+1}} = 0, \text{ if } \xi_i = \xi_{i+1},\ n = 0,1,\dots,$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta.

Consider the state $(\xi_0,\xi_1,\xi_2,\dots,\xi_n)$. It can be obtained with the input $H^t\in\mathcal{U}^*$, as describes Lemma 4.2. Taking into account Corollary 3.0.1, it is not difficult to see that if $\xi_1=\xi_0$, the state $(\xi_0,\xi_2,\dots,\xi_n)$ can be obtained with the input $-H^t$. Usually we may interest in the read-out functions that satisfy one of the two symmetry conditions:

(Ys) $\quad y_n(\xi_0,\xi_1,\xi_2,\dots,\xi_n) = y_{n-1}(\xi_0,\xi_2,\dots,\xi_n), \text{ if } \xi_1=\xi_0,\ n=1,2,\dots,$

(Ya) $\quad y_n(\xi_0,\xi_1,\xi_2\dots,\xi_n) = -y_{n-1}(\xi_0,\xi_2,\dots,\xi_n), \text{ if } \xi_1=\xi_0\ n=1,2,\dots.$

We call these functions *symmetric* and *antisymmetric* respectively. Antisymmetric functions can describe magnetization M, B-field, and H-field, see, e.g., (4.7). The symmetric functions can describe physical values like the energy of the system or magnetostrictive deformation. For antisymmetric functions $y_0(0) = 0$, because $y_1(0,0) = -y_0(0)$ due to **(Ya)** and $y_1(0,0) = y_0(0)$ due to **(Y0)**. It is easy to check that the following proposition holds:

Proposition 5.2. *Any functions $y_n(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$, $n = 0, 1 \dots$, can be expressed as the sum of its symmetric and antisymmetric parts:*

$$y_n^{(s)}(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = \frac{1}{2}[y_n(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) + y_{n+1}(\xi_0, \xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)],$$
$$y_n^{(a)}(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = \frac{1}{2}[y_n(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) - y_{n+1}(\xi_0, \xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)].$$

6 Transformations of the State Variables

Coordinates $\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n$ were introduced via the values $\Delta H_0, \dots \Delta H_n$. However, nothing prevented from using, for example, the magnetization changes ΔM_i instead of ΔH_i. This observation shows that there must be a class of coordinate transformations which preserve conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)**, **(Ys)**, **(Ya)**, and the state transition law.

Let us describe, how the new coordinates can be introduced with any sequence of antisymmetric functions $u_n(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n)$ that satisfies conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)**, **(Ya)**, and the following condition:

$$(-1)^{n+1}\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \xi_n} \geq \varepsilon > 0, \ n = 0, 1, \dots , \tag{6.1}$$

which means that $u(t)$ strictly increases (decreases) when the input $H(t)$ increases (decreases). The transformation between the old and new coordinates reads

$$\xi_0' = \varphi_0(\xi_0), \quad \xi_1' = \varphi_1(\xi_0, \xi_1) , \ \dots \ , \ \xi_n' = \varphi_n(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n), \tag{6.2}$$

where

$$\varphi_0(\xi_0) = -2u_0(\xi_0),$$
$$\varphi_k(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_k) = (-1)^{k-1}\left[u_k(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_k) - u_{k-1}(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{k-1})\right], \quad k = 1, \dots , n. \tag{6.3}$$

It can be seen that the new coordinates $\xi_0', \dots , \xi_n'$ are defined using the differences Δu_k in the same way as the coordinates $\xi_0, \dots , \xi_n$ are defined by ΔH_k; $u_n(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n)$ can be expressed via φ_n as follows:

$$u_n(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n) = -\frac{1}{2}\varphi_0(\xi_0) + \varphi_1(\xi_0, \xi_1) - \dots \pm \varphi_n(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n). \tag{6.4}$$

Lemma 6.1. *Functions $\varphi_k(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_k)$ defined in (6.3) satisfy the following conditions:*

(i) If $\xi_i = 0$ then $\xi_i' = 0$, $i = 0, 1, \dots , n$;

(ii) If $\xi_{i+1} = \xi_i$ then $\xi_{i+1}' = \xi_i'$, $i = 0, 1, \dots , n-1$;

(iii) If $\xi_{i+1} = \xi_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots , k-2$, $k = 3, 4, \dots , n$ then

$$\varphi_k(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \dots, \xi_k) = \varphi_{k-2}(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+2}, \dots, \xi_k); \tag{6.5}$$

(iv) If $\xi_1 = \xi_0$, $k = 2, 3, \dots , n$, then

$$2\frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial \xi_0} + \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial \xi_1} = \frac{\partial \varphi_0}{\partial \xi_0} \quad \text{and} \quad 2\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial \xi_0} + \frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial \xi_1} = 0; \tag{6.6}$$

(v) If $\xi_1 = \xi_0,\ k = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ *then*

$$\varphi_k(\xi_0, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_k) = \varphi_{k-1}(\xi_0, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_k). \tag{6.7}$$

Proof. The lemma is easy to prove using conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)**, **(Ys)** imposed on $u_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)$. Item (i) follows from **(Y0)**, items (ii) and (iii) from **(Y1)**, item (iv) from **(Y2)**, and item (v) from **(Ys)**. □

The coordinate transformation (6.2) can be inverted according to the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *Coordinate transformation (6.2) is a bijection* $D_n(\xi_M) \to D_n(\xi'_M)$*, where* $\xi'_M = \varphi_0(\xi_M)$*. The inverse transformation reads*

$$\xi_0 = \tilde{\varphi}'_0(\xi'_0), \quad \xi_1 = \tilde{\varphi}'_1(\xi'_0, \xi'_1)\,, \ \ldots\ , \ \xi_n = \tilde{\varphi}'_n(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n), \tag{6.8}$$

and

$$\xi'_i = 0 \quad \textit{if and only if} \quad \xi_i = 0, \quad \xi'_i = \xi'_{i+1} \quad \textit{if and only if} \quad \xi_i = \xi_{i+1}. \tag{6.9}$$

Proof. Due to (6.1), (6.3), for $k = 0, 1 \ldots, n$ it holds $\partial\varphi_k/\partial\xi_k \geq \varepsilon > 0$. Obviously, φ_0 is a bijection $[0, \xi_M] \to [0, \varphi_0(\xi_M)]$. According to Lemma 6.1, items (i),(ii), φ_k, as a function of the last argument ξ_k, is a bijection $[0, \xi_{k-1}] \to [0, \xi'_{k-1}]$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. Solving equations (6.2) one-by-one gives (6.8) and (6.9). □

Here and below we mark functions expressed in the new coordinates $\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n$ by the prime symbol ($'$). In this notations using (6.2), (6.8), we can write

$$y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n) = y_n(\tilde{\varphi}'_0(\xi'_0), \ldots, \tilde{\varphi}'_n(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n)) = y'_n(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n) = y'_n(\varphi_0(\xi_0), \ldots, \varphi_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)). \tag{6.10}$$

Proposition 6.1. *A sequence of functions* $y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)$*,* $n = 0, 1, \ldots$*, that satisfies conditions* **(Y0)** – **(Y2)***, and, possibly, one of the symmetry condition* **(Ys)** *or* **(Ya)***, satisfies the same conditions in the new coordinates (6.2).*

Proof. For any function y_n and y'_n expressed in the old and in the new coordinates there holds

$$y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n) = y'_n(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n) = y'_n(\varphi_0(\xi_0), \ldots, \varphi_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)). \tag{6.11}$$

Let $\xi'_n = 0$. Then, according to Lemma 6.2, $\xi_n = 0$ and $y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{n-1}, \xi_n) = y_{n-1}(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{n-1})$ due to **(Y0)**. Because $y'_{n-1}(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_{n-1}) = y_{n-1}(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{n-1})$ we have $y'_n(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_{n-1}, 0) = y'_{n-1}(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_{n-1})$. Thus, **(Y0)** holds in the new coordinates.

Let $\xi'_{i+1} = \xi'_i$, for some $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Then, according to Lemma 6.2, $\xi_{i+1} = \xi_i$, and $y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_n) = y_{n-2}(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi_{n-1})$ due to **(Y1)**. As can be seen from item (iii) of Lemma 6.1, if $\xi'_{i+1} = \xi'_i$ then $\xi'_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi'_n$ are the same as in the function $y'_{n-2}(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_{i-1}, \xi'_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi'_{n-1}) = y_{n-2}(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi_{n-1})$. Thus, **(Y1)** holds in the new coordinates.

Differentiating (6.11) by ξ_1, ξ_0 and combining the terms in the result gives

$$2\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_0} + \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \xi_1} = 2\frac{\partial y'_n}{\partial \xi'_0} \cdot \frac{\partial \varphi_0}{\partial \xi_0} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial y'_n}{\partial \xi'_k} \cdot \left(2\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial \xi_0} + \frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial \xi_1}\right).$$

Let $\xi'_1 = \xi'_0$. Then $\xi_1 = \xi_0$ according to Lemma 6.2, and the left side is zero due to **(Y2)**. Taking into account item (iv) of Lemma 6.1, from the above equation follows

$$\frac{\partial \varphi_0}{\partial \xi_0} \cdot \left(2\frac{\partial y'_n}{\partial \xi'_0} + \frac{\partial y'_n}{\partial \xi'_1}\right) = 0,$$

Because $\partial\varphi_0/\partial\xi_0 \neq 0$, we can conclude that **(Y2)** holds in the new coordinates.

In the similar way, using item (v) of Lemma 6.1, it can be found that if one of conditions **(Ys)** or **(Ya)** holds for $y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)$ then, respectively, $y'_n(\xi'_0, \xi'_1, \ldots, \xi'_n) = y'_{n-1}(\xi'_0, \xi'_2, \ldots, \xi'_n)$ or $y'_n(\xi'_0, \xi'_1, \ldots, \xi'_n) = -y'_{n-1}(\xi'_0, \xi'_2, \ldots, \xi'_n)$. □

Proposition 6.2. *Let the functions $u_n(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n)$ determine the coordinate transformation (6.2) according to (6.3). Then the state transition law in the new coordinates for δu reads exactly the same as it reads in the old coordinates for δH.*

Proof. Let us note that the signs of δu and δH are always the same. As we can see from Table 4.1, the only variable that changes when H changes is the last variable ξ_n. This is true with one exception, which will be considered separately. Due to (6.2), only ξ'_n depends on ξ_n, and, according to (6.4), $|\delta u| = \delta\xi'_n$. Hence, if the state is $(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n)$, n even and $\delta H < 0$, or n odd and $\delta H > 0$, the new state in old coordinates is $(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n + |\delta H|)$, and in the new coordinates it is $(\xi'_0,\dots,\xi'_n + |\delta u|)$. If the state is $(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n)$, n even and $\delta H > 0$, or n odd and $\delta H < 0$, the new state in old coordinates is $(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n,|\delta H|)$, and in the new coordinates it is $(\xi'_0,\dots,\xi'_n,|\delta u|)$.

The exception is (ξ_0,ξ_0), $\delta H > 0$. When the state is (ξ_0,ξ_0) and $\delta H > 0$, the new state in the old coordinates is $(\xi_0+|\delta H|,\xi_0+|\delta H|)$. It is easy to check, that in the new coordinates it is $(\xi'_0+|\delta u|,\xi'_0+|\delta u|)$. □

According to (6.4), (4.7) and (6.10), in the new coordinates we have

$$u'_n(\xi'_0,\dots,\xi'_n) = -\frac{1}{2}\xi'_0 + \xi'_1 - \dots \pm \xi'_n, \tag{6.12}$$

$$H'_n(\xi'_0,\dots,\xi'_n) = -\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\varphi}'_0(\xi'_0) + \tilde{\varphi}'_1(\xi'_0,\xi'_1) - \dots \pm \tilde{\varphi}'_n(\xi'_0,\dots,\xi'_n), \tag{6.13}$$

As can be seen from (4.7), $H_n(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n)$ satisfy conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)** and **(Ya)** in coordinates $\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n$. Thus, according to Proposition 6.1, $H'_n(\xi'_0,\dots,\xi'_n)$ must satisfy **(Y0)** – **(Y2)** and **(Ya)** in coordinates $\xi'_0,\dots,\xi'_n$. Due to Proposition 6.2, the variable u associated with functions $u_n(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n)$ determines the state transition law according to Table 4.1, assuming that δH is replaced with δu, and the old coordinates are replaced with the new ones.

7 Algebraic Properties of Read-Out Functions

Termwise operations can be performed on sequences of functions that satisfy conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)**, **(Ys)**, **(Ya)**. Let $f_n(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n)$, $g_n(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n)$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$ satisfy conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)**. The functions listed in the Table 7.1 also satisfy **(Y0)** – **(Y2)**, and have the symmetry as stated therein. In the table below constants α,β,λ are real numbers, $\lambda > 0$, $d\varphi(\xi)/d\xi > 0$, $\varphi(0) = 0$, and F – any differentiable function.

Table 7.1: Invariance of **(Y0)** - **(Y2)** with respect to algebraic operations

Function	**Symmetry**
$\alpha f_n + \beta g_n$	If u_n and v_n have the same symmetry, the symmetry of the result is also the same
$f_n \cdot g_n$	If f_n, g_n have the same symmetry, the result is symmetric. If f_n, g_n have the opposite symmetry, the result is antisymmetric
$f_n(\lambda\xi_0,\lambda\xi_1,\dots,\lambda\xi_n)$ where $\lambda > 0$	The result has the symmetry of f_n
$f_n(\varphi(\xi_0),\varphi(\xi_1),\dots,\varphi(\xi_n))$	The result has the symmetry of f_n
$F(f_n(\xi_0,\xi_1,\dots,\xi_n))$	If f_n is symmetric, the result is symmetric. If f_n is antisymmetric, the result is symmetric for even F and antisymmetric for odd F

Let us consider in brief some examples as the illustration of the above.

Rayleigh Law [1, 4]. Functions

$$H(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_n) = -\frac{1}{2}\xi_0 + \xi_1 - \dots \pm \xi_n \tag{7.1}$$

satisfy **(Y0)** – **(Y2)** and are antisymmetric. According to the Table 7.1, functions

$$M(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n) = -\frac{1}{2}\varphi(\xi_0) + \varphi(\xi_1) - \ldots \pm \varphi(\xi_n) \tag{7.2}$$

satisfy **(Y0)** – **(Y2)** and are antisymmetric. This pair of functions describe congruent multiple order reversal curves in the H-M plane. Any hysteresis branch other than initial magnetization curve can be described by equation

$$\Delta M = \varphi(\Delta H), \tag{7.3}$$

were ΔH and ΔM are absolute values of changes the field and the magnetization relative to the reversal point. It can be seen that for proper orientation of hysteresis loop must be $\partial^2\varphi(\xi)/\partial\xi^2 > 0$. The initial magnetization curve is

$$M = \pm\frac{1}{2}\varphi(\pm 2H), \tag{7.4}$$

where "+" corresponds to ascending and "−" to descending branches. Ascending and descending branches of symmetric hystersis cycles can be expressed as follows:

$$M \pm M_m = \pm\varphi(H_m \pm H), \quad M_m = \frac{1}{2}\varphi(2H_m), \tag{7.5}$$

where H_m, M_m denote the field and the magnetization in the upper vertex of the symmetric cycle. Letting $\varphi(\xi) = a\xi + b\xi^2/2$ gives the well-known Rayleigh Law.

Inverse hysteresis. In the usual case, the differential susceptibility is positive on the hysteresis branches, so that $M(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)$ complies with (6.1), and new coordinates $\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n$ determined by $M(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)$ can be introduced. As follows from Proposition 6.2, the new coordinates describe the state transitions with respect to δM in the same way as the old ones with respect to δH. According to (6.12) in the new coordinates we have

$$M(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n) = -\frac{1}{2}\xi'_0 + \xi'_1 - \ldots \pm \xi'_n,$$

while $H(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n)$ must satisfy **(Y0)** – **(Y2)**. One of the possible approximations for $H(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n)$ has been proposed in [8]:

$$H(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n) = a(M) \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2}\varphi(\xi'_0) + \varphi(\xi'_1) - \ldots \pm \varphi(\xi'_n)\right) + b(M),$$

where $a(M) = a\left(-\frac{1}{2}\xi'_0 + \xi'_1 - \ldots \pm \xi'_n\right)$ and $b(M) = b\left(-\frac{1}{2}\xi'_0 + \xi'_1 - \ldots \pm \xi'_n\right)$ must be even and odd functions of M respectively. In this case $H(\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n)$ is antisymmetric, as it must be.

8 Relation to the Preisach model

The Preisach model [1, 10, 11, 13], see also [5], has several variants and is considered as the most powerful hysteresis model. We examine here only the simplest case that is usually called classical Preisah model.

The output of the model can be expressed via the integrals of the Preisach distribution function over the triangles (see Fig. 8.1), and, as a function of the reduced memory sequence $H_0, \ldots, H_k$ with $H_0 < 0$, reads as follows:

$$y_n(H_0, \ldots, H_n) - y_0(0) = -E(H_0) + E(H_0, H_1) - E(H_1, H_2) + \ldots \pm E(H_{n-1}, H_n), \tag{8.1}$$

where $y_0(0)$ is the output in the demagnetized state, i.e., the constant value, and $E(\alpha, \beta)$ is the symmetric Everett function, $E(\alpha, \beta) = E(\beta, \alpha)$, which represents the multiplied by 2 integral of the Preisach distribution over the triangle $T(\alpha, \beta)$.



Figure 8.1: The input $H(t)$ applied to the Preisach model in the demagnetized state (left). Preisach diagram in coordinates h_c, h_u and the state variables $\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n$ (right). The line shown in bold is the boundary $h_u = b(h_c)$ between hysterons in the positive and negative states. The demagnetized state corresponds to the boundary that coincides with the h_c axis. The output of the Preisach model can be expressed via integrals of the Preisach distribution function over the "initial magnetization triangle" OH_0b_0 and the triangles $T(H_0, H_1) = H_0H_1b_1$, $T(H_1, H_2) = H_1H_2b_2$, $T(H_2, H_3) = H_2H_3b_3$.

The equation for $E(\alpha, \beta)$ reads

$$E(\alpha,\beta) = 2\int_{\beta}^{\alpha}\int_{\beta}^{\alpha'} \mu(\alpha',\beta')\, d\alpha'\, d\beta', \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha' = h_u + h_c, \quad \beta' = h_u - h_c, \quad \alpha \geq \beta, \tag{8.2}$$

and $\mu(\alpha, \beta)$ is the Preisach distribution function in the (α, β)-plane. The symmetry of $E(\alpha, \beta)$ follows naturally from its definition as integral over the triangle $T(\alpha, \beta)$. It can not be derived from (8.2), because $\alpha \leq \beta$ imply $\alpha' \leq \beta'$, i.e., for $\alpha \leq \beta$ the triangle belongs to the other half-plane.

The first term in (8.1), $E(H_0)$, is multiplied by 2 integral over the "initial magnetization triangle", like OA_0B_0 in Fig. 8.1. If the Preisach distribution function is symmetric with respect to h_c axis, $y_0(0) = 0$ and $E(H_0) = E(H_0, -H_0)/2$.

If the $E(\alpha, \beta)$ is known, $\mu(\alpha, \beta)$ can be found by differentiating (8.2),

$$\mu(\alpha,\beta) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 E(\alpha,\beta)}{\partial\alpha\,\partial\beta}, \quad \alpha \geq \beta. \tag{8.3}$$

Let us consider conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)** for $y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)$, assuming that $H_0, \ldots, H_n$ in the right side of (8.1) are expressed via $\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n$ according to (4.6). If $\xi_n = 0$ then $H_n = H_{n-1}$ and $E(H_{n-1}, H_n) = 0$, therefore we have $y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{n-1}, 0) = y_{n-1}(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{n-1})$, i.e., **(Y0)** holds true. Let $\xi_{k+1} = \xi_k$ for some k, $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. This pair of variables vanishes from all terms $E(H_{r-1}, H_r)$ such that $r \geq k$, and $E(H_{k-1}, H_k)$, $E(H_k, H_{k+1})$ become equal canceling each other out. Thus, $y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n) = y_{n-2}(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{k-1}, \xi_{k+2}, \ldots \xi_n)$, which means that **(Y1)** holds true.

Obviously, each term $E(H_k, H_{k+1})$ satisfy **(Y2)** for $k = 1, \ldots, n-1$. For remaining two terms, taking into account (4.6), we have

$$\left(2\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_0} + \frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_1}\right)\big[-E(H_0) + H(H_0, H_1)\big] = \frac{\partial E(H_0)}{\partial H_0} - \frac{\partial E(H_0, H_1)}{\partial H_0}. \tag{8.4}$$

As follows from (4.6), if $\xi_0 = \xi_1$ then $H_1 = -H_0$, and vice versa. From the Preisach diagram in Fig 8.1 it can be seen directly that the right side of (8.4) is zero if $H_1 = -H_0$; this means that **(Y2)** holds true.

Let $H_1 = H_0$, and H_1 in $E(H_0, H_1)$ increases by the value δH. Assume that H_0 in $E(H_0)$ increases by the same value. It can be seen that both the triangles increase its areas by almost the same strips. (The strips differs by the triangle, which area is $(\delta\xi)^2/4$). Hence, the right side of (8.4) is zero if $\mu(\alpha, \beta)$ is bounded for $\alpha > \beta$.

Equation (8.4) allows to express $E(H_0)$ via $E(\alpha, \beta)$ and rewrite (8.1) in the following form:

$$y_n(H_0, \ldots, H_n) - y_0(0) = -\int_0^{H_0} \frac{\partial E(\alpha, \beta)}{\partial \alpha}\Big|_{\beta=-\alpha} d\alpha + E(H_0, H_1) - E(H_2, H_3) + \ldots \pm E(H_{n-1}, H_n). \quad (8.5)$$

The output (8.5) satisfy conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)** if $E(\alpha, \beta)$ has partial derivatives, is symmetric with respect to its arguments, and turns into zero when $\alpha = \beta$. Note, that the left and right derivatives on the line $\alpha = \beta$ are not necessarily equal, because the points $H_k = H_{k+1}$ are newer crossed.

As an example, let $E(\alpha, \beta) = \varphi(|\alpha - \beta|)$, where φ is an arbitrary smooth function such that $\varphi(0) = 0$. Taking into account (4.6), it can be seen that in this case (8.5) turns into (7.2). The Preisach distribution function determined by (8.3) has a Dirac delta term:

$$\mu(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{2}\varphi''(\alpha - \beta) + \varphi'(0) \cdot \delta(\alpha - \beta), \quad \alpha \geq \beta.$$

This shows that the smoothness of $\mu(\alpha, \beta)$ in the classical Preisach model is, in some sense, more strict condition than the smoothness of $y(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)$ according to (5.2). Without the delta term, the initial susceptibility is zero at the reversal points for any Preisach distribution function. This effect is eliminated in the moving Preisach model by introducing the mean field interaction.

Another element of the Preisach model that can be expressed via coordinates $\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n$, is the staircase boundary $b(h_c)$ between the Preisach units in $+1$ and -1 states. Taking into account (4.4), it can be seen that the h_c-coordinates of points $b_0, \ldots, b_3$ are $\xi_0/2, \ldots, \xi_3/2$ correspondingly, and the state evolution rules in ξ-coordinates are the same as presented in Table 4.1. Also, it is not difficult to obtain the following equation for the boundary:

$$b(h_c) = \int_{2h_c}^{\infty} \left[-\frac{1}{2}e(\xi_0 - \xi) + e(\xi_1 - \xi) - e(\xi_2 - \xi) + \ldots \pm e(\xi_n - \xi) \right] d\xi,$$

where e denotes the Heaviside step function. Two states of Preisach model differ in the number of the hysterons enclosed between two boundaries $b(h_c)$. Thus, the distance between the boundaries can be considered as a distance between states of the Preisach model. Probably, we can use the same metric for the states parametrized by coordinates $\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n$ irrespective of the Preisach model. For example, it can be a metric induced by the following norm:

$$\max_{\xi \in [0, \xi_M]} \left| \int_{\xi}^{\xi_M} \left[-\frac{1}{2}e(\xi_0 - \xi') + e(\xi_1 - \xi') - e(\xi_2 - \xi') + \ldots \pm e(\xi_n - \xi') \right] d\xi' \right|,$$

where the integrands are considered as a subset in the linear space of integrable functions.

As it can be seen from the above, the state-space of the Preisach model can be parametrized by the variables $\xi_0, \xi_1 \ldots, \xi_n$. All conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)** hold true for the classical Preisach model, as it must be, because the model exhibits the return point memory and has the reachable demagnetized state. However, the Preisach model uses a definite form of the read-out functions (8.1), which is, from the point of view studied in this article, a special case.

9 Conclusions

The definition of the input-output system includes a set of admissible inputs $\mathcal{U}$ and a set of output variables Y. These two sets determine the experiments that can be used to study the behavior of the system put into a fixed initial state before each experiment. If the input equivalence is known, the state-space and the state transition law can be established without modeling the internal structure of the system. This approach is applicable to the deterministic stationary input-output systems, not necessary hysteretic (see Appendix A).

This method does not take into account energy conservation law or any other thermodynamic restrictions. In this aspect, the description based on the input equivalence is similar to kinematics.

In the case of the scalar hysteresis, the input equivalence is determined by the return point memory and rate independence, as described in Section 2. Coordinates $\xi_0, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ in the state-space are introduced via the differences ΔH_i along the hysteresis branches. The consistency with the return point memory and the reachability of the demagnetized state provide necessary and sufficient conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)** on the read-out functions $y_n(\xi_0, \xi_1 \ldots, \xi_n)$.

The coordinate transformations allow to switch to coordinates $\xi'_0, \ldots, \xi'_n$ that have the same properties with respect to a different input, e.g., $M(t)$ instead of $H(t)$. In this way, a direct and a reverse ferromagnetic hysteresis can be expressed in the similar form. A set of termwise operations can be performed on the sequences of functions $y_n(\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_n)$ without violating conditions **(Y0)** – **(Y2)**. Together with the coordinate transformations, it can be used as a tool for building different approximations of multiple order reversal curves. Though the consideration is made in the framework of magnetic hysteresis, the results, probably, can be applied or adapted to other manifestations of hysteresis.

References

[1] G. Bertotti. *Hysteresis in Magnetism (for physicists, materials scientists, and engineers).* Academic Press, Boston, 1998.

[2] G. Bertotti and I.D. Mayergoyz, editors. *The science of hysteresis: Hysteresis in Materials. Vol. 3.* Elsevier Series in Electromagnetism. Elsevier, 2006.

[3] M. Brokate and J. Sprekels. *Hysteresis and Phase Transition*, chapter 2. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[4] S. Chikazumi. *Physics of Ferromagnetism.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997.

[5] R. B. Gorbet, K. A. Morrish, and D. W. L. Wang. Control of hysteretic systems: a state-space approach. In *Learning, control and hybrid systems*, pages 432–451. Springer London, 1999.

[6] R.E. Kalman, P.L. Falb, and M.A. Arbib. *Topics in Mathematical System Theory*, chapter 7. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1969.

[7] M. A. Krasnosel'skii and A. V. Pokrovskii. *Systems with hysteresis.* Nauka, Moscow, 1983.

[8] S. E. Langvagen. Yet another hysteresis model. *cond-mat/0103573*, Mar 2001.

[9] E. Madelung. Über Magnetisierung durch schnell verlaufende Ströme und die Wirkungsweise des Rutherford-Marconischen Magnetdetektors. *Annalen der Physik*, 17(5):861–890, 1905.

[10] I. D. Mayergoyz. *Mathematical Models of Hysteresis and Their Applications: Second Edition.* Electromagnetism. Academic Press, 2003.

[11] E. Della Torre. *Magnetic Hysteresis.* IEEE Press, Pscataway, NJ, 1999.

[12] J. Poderman and J. C. Willems. *Introduction to Mathematical System Theory*, chapter 6. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[13] F. Preisach. Über die magnetische nachwirkung. *Zeitschrift für Physick.*, 94:277–302, 1935.

[14] J. P. Sethna, K. Dahmen, S. Kartha, J. A. Krumhansl, B. W. Roberts, and J. D. Shore. Hysteresis and hierarchies: dynamics of disorder-driven first-order phase transformations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 70:3347, 1993.

[15] A. Visintin. Mathematical models of hysteresis. In G. Bertotti and I.D. Mayergoyz, editors, *The science of hysteresis: Mathematical Modeling and Applications. Vol. 1*, chapter 1. Elsevier, 2006.

[16] J. C. Willems. Dissipative dynamical systems, Part I: General theory. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, 45:321–351, 1972.

[17] Xiangjun Xing. A semigroup theory of rate independent hysteresis. *cond-mat.dis-nn/0707.3302*, Jul 2007.

A Appendix: State-Space of the Input-Output Systems

This Appendix describes how the state-space and the state transition law can be established for any stationary input-output system, assuming that the input equivalence is known from the experiments. Its aim is to provide a background to the consideration presented in the main part of the article. The starting point is a definition of the input-output system close to one given in [16].

Definition A.1. An input-output system $\Sigma = \Sigma(U,\mathcal{U},Y,\mathcal{Y},F)$ is a collection of a set U of *input variables*, an *input space* $\mathcal{U}$ of U-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}$, a set Y of *output variables*, an *output space* $\mathcal{Y}$ of Y-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}$, and an *input-output map* F from $\mathcal{U}$ into $\mathcal{Y}$, such that the following conditions are met:

(i) For any $T \in \mathbb{R}$, if $u(t) \in \mathcal{U},\ y(t) \in \mathcal{Y}$, then $u(t+T) \in \mathcal{U},\ y(t+T) \in \mathcal{Y}$;

(ii) For any $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$, if $u_1(t') = u_2(t')$ for all $t' \le t$, then $F[u_1](t') = F[u_2](t')$ for all $t' \le t$;

(iii) For any $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$, $T \in \mathbb{R}$, if $u_2(t) = u_1(t+T)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then $F[u_2](t) = F[u_1](t+T)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$;

(iv) For any $u \in \mathcal{U}$, there exists a value $t_0(u)$ such that $u(t) = u_0$ for all $t \le t_0$. The value u_0 is the same for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$.

We interpret the definition of Σ as a description of the system's behavior in a class of experiments specified by the set of admissible inputs $\mathcal{U}$ and the set of measured output variables Y. The properties of the system itself are represented by the map F. In the above definition item (i) means that the spaces $\mathcal{U},\mathcal{Y}$ are closed under the shift operator; items (ii) and (iii) mean that the system assumed to be *deterministic* and *stationary*. Determinism reflects the fact that the input completely determines the output, and the future can not influence the past. Stationarity means that the experiments with the system can be performed at any time with the same result.

Because it is impossible to start experiment at $t = -\infty$, it is assumed that the system is put into the same initial state x_0 at the beginning t_0 of each experiment, where x_0 is a steady state under the constant input u_0. The term "put into the initial state" means that we do something with the system that makes the output be uniquely determined by the input. The system must not change while $u(t) = u_0$, and hence we can let $u(t) = u_0$ for $t \le t_0(u)$ according to item (iv) of the definition.

Definition A.2. The restriction of the input u to the interval $(-\infty, t)$ is designated as u^t and called *input* along with the inputs defined on the interval $(-\infty,\infty)$. The set of all inputs u^t is designated as $\mathcal{U}^t$, and the union $\bigcup\limits_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{U}^t$ is designated as $\mathcal{U}^*$. Any input $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\tilde{u}^t = u^t$ is called *prolongation* of the input u^t.

We denote the restriction of an input $u \in \mathcal{U}$ to the interval $[t_1, t_2)$ as $u^{[t_1,t_2)}$, and concatenation of two restricted inputs as $u^{[t_1,t_2)} \vee u^{[t_2,t_3)}$. Notations for the outputs are defined in the similar way.

Note that the point t does not belong to the domain of u^t. Inputs and outputs are not necessary assumed to be continuous functions of time. Thus, we must take care for the time intervals not to overlap. For continuous inputs and outputs instead of $(-\infty, t)$, $[t_1, t_2)$ can be used $(-\infty, t]$ and $[t_1, t_2]$, see also Proposition A.5.

Let us define *equivalent inputs* as the inputs from $\mathcal{U}^t$ that are not distinguishable after the end time t in the experiments with the system as follows.

Definition A.3. We call inputs $u_1^t, u_2^t \in \mathcal{U}^t$ *equivalent* and write $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$ if both two conditions are met:

(i) For any prolongation $\tilde{u}_1$ of u_1^t there exists a prolongation $\tilde{u}_2$ of u_2^t, and vice versa, such that $\tilde{u}_1^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_2^{[t,\infty)}$;

(ii) For any prolongations $\tilde{u}_1$, $\tilde{u}_2$ of u_1^t, u_2^t, such that $\tilde{u}_1^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_2^{[t,\infty)}$, there holds $\tilde{y}_1^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{y}_2^{[t,\infty)}$, where $\tilde{y}_1 = F[\tilde{u}_1]$, $\tilde{y}_2 = F[\tilde{u}_2]$

The item (i) means that the equivalent inputs can be always compared using the prolongations that are the same after the end time t. According to the item (ii), such prolongations must yield the same outputs after t. The binary relation "$\sim$" on $\mathcal{U}^t$ is the *equivalence relation* according to the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. *The binary relation on the set of inputs $\mathcal{U}^t$ introduced by Definition A.3 is reflexive ($u^t \sim u^t$), symmetric (if $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$ then $u_2^t \sim u_1^t$), and transitive (if $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$ and $u_2^t \sim u_3^t$ then $u_1^t \sim u_3^t$).*

Proof. The reflexivity and the symmetry are obvious. To prove the transitivity, let $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$ and $u_2^t \sim u_3^t$. According to Definition A.3, for any prolongation $\tilde{u}_1$ there exists the prolongation $\tilde{u}_2$ such that $\tilde{u}_1^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_2^{[t,\infty)}$. Similarly, for prolongation $\tilde{u}_2$ must exist $\tilde{u}_3$, such that $\tilde{u}_2^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_3^{[t,\infty)}$. Thus, $\tilde{u}_1^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_3^{[t,\infty)}$, and the first condition of Definition A.3 is met.

Suppose now that for prolongations $\tilde{u}_1$ of u_1^t and $\tilde{u}_3$ of u_3^t there holds $\tilde{u}_1^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_3^{[t,\infty)}$. Because $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$ and $u_2^t \sim u_3^t$ there exist prolongations $\tilde{u}_{2'}$ and $\tilde{u}_{2''}$ of u_2^t such that $\tilde{u}_{2'}^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_1^{[t,\infty)}$ and $\tilde{u}_{2''}^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_3^{[t,\infty)}$. However, $\tilde{u}_1^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_3^{[t,\infty)}$, which means that $\tilde{u}_{2'} = \tilde{u}_{2''}$. Due to $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$ and $u_2^t \sim u_3^t$ we have $\tilde{y}_1^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{y}_{2'}^{[t,\infty)}$ and $\tilde{y}_3^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{y}_{2''}^{[t,\infty)}$. Hence, $\tilde{y}_1^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{y}_3^{[t,\infty)}$. □

With Definition A.3, the inputs u^t, $v^t \in \mathcal{U}^t$, i.e. the inputs ending at the same time t, can be compared. To compare inputs $u_1^{t_1}$, $u_2^{t_2} \in \mathcal{U}^*$, we can shift one of them or both to make the end times equal and compare them using Definition A.3. Let us introduce the shift operator σ^T on $\mathcal{U}^*$ that acts on the input u^t as follows: $\sigma^T u^t(t') = u^{t+T}(t' - T)$. Of course, usually $\sigma^T u^t \neq u^{t+T}$, however, we can write $\sigma^{T_1}\sigma^{T_2} = \sigma^{T_1+T_2}$ and $\sigma^T \mathcal{U}^t = \mathcal{U}^{t+T}$.

Lemma A.2. *The equivalence relations on the sets of inputs $\mathcal{U}^t$ are invariant under the shift operator, i.e., if $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$, then for any $T \in \mathbb{R}$ there holds $\sigma^T u_1^t \sim \sigma^T u_2^t$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward, taking into account the stationarity condition according to Definition A.1. □

Using Lemma A.2, we can extend the input equivalence from sets $\mathcal{U}^t$ to the set $\mathcal{U}^*$ as defined below.

Definition A.4. Inputs $u_1^{t_1}, u_2^{t_2} \in \mathcal{U}^*$ we call equivalent and write $u_1^{t_1} \sim u_2^{t_2}$ if and only if the inputs $\sigma^{t_1-t_2}u_2^{t_2}$ and $u_1^{t_1}$ are equivalent in the sense of Definition A.3.

Proposition A.1. *The binary relation introduced by Definition A.3 and extended to the set $\mathcal{U}^*$ according to Definition A.4 is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive, i.e., is the equivalence relation.*

Proof. The reflexivity follows directly from Lemma A.1. The symmetry can be proved by applying $\sigma^{t_2-t_1}$ to the both sides of the relation $\sigma^{t_1-t_2}u_2^{t_2} \sim u_1^{t_1}$ and using Lemma A.2. To prove the transitivity, assume that $u_1^{t_1} \sim \sigma^{t_1-t_2}u_2^{t_2}$, $u_2^{t_2} \sim \sigma^{t_2-t_3}u_3^{t_3}$. By applying $\sigma^{t_1-t_2}$ to the both sides of the second equivalence and using the transitivity of "$\sim$" on $\mathcal{U}^{t_1}$, we get $u_1^{t_1} \sim \sigma^{t_1-t_3}u_3^{t_3}$, which proves the statement. □

It is well known that an equivalence relation partitions the set into *equivalence classes*, so that each element of the set belongs to one and only one class, and all elements in one class are equivalent. *Projection map* gives the equivalence class by the element of the set. The projection map is determined by the equivalence relation and, vice versa, the equivalence relation is determined by the projection map.

Definition A.5. Let "$\sim$" be the equivalence relation on $\mathcal{U}^*$ according to Definition A.4. Then the set of equivalence classes $X = \mathcal{U}^*/\sim$ is called *(minimal) space of states* of the system Σ. The corresponding projection map is designated as $\Gamma : \mathcal{U}^* \to X$.

Giving the name "state" to equivalence class $x \in X$ is approved by the following consideration.

According to the definition of equivalence classes, $u_1^{t_1} \sim u_2^{t_2}$ is the same as $u_1^{t_1}, u_2^{t_2} \in x$ for some $x \in X$, and $\Gamma(u_1^{t_1}) = \Gamma(u_2^{t_2})$ if and only if $u_1^{t_1} \sim u_2^{t_2}$. For each input $u^t \in \mathcal{U}^*$ there exists one and only one equivalence class x such that $u^t \in x$. We can write

$$x(t) = \Gamma(u^t), \tag{A.1}$$

where the state x is associated with the end time of the input u^t. This means that if the system evolves under some input $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $x(t)$ shows its state at each time instance t. The "initial state" x_0 introduced earlier to establish the connection between a physical system and its mathematical description, is, in terms of the equivalence classes, the set of constant inputs such that $u^t(t') = u_0$ for all $t' \in (-\infty, t)$. For any $u \in \mathcal{U}$, according to item (iv) of Definition A.1 we have $x(t) = x_0$ if $t < t_0(u)$.

Let us denote as $\mathcal{U}^{[t,t+s)}(x)$, $s > 0$, the set of inputs $u \in \mathcal{U}$ restricted to the interval $[t, t+s)$, such that $u^t \in x$.

Proposition A.2. *The projection map Γ determines the state transition function $\phi : X \times \mathcal{U}^{[t,t+s)}(x) \to X$, such that for any $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and any $s > 0$ there holds*

$$x(t+s) = \phi\left(x(t), u^{[t,t+s)}\right). \tag{A.2}$$

Lemma A.3. *For any $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ and $s > 0$, if $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$, then $u_1^t \vee u_2^{[t,t+s)} \in \mathcal{U}^{t+s}$ and $u_2^t \vee u_1^{[t,t+s)} \in \mathcal{U}^{t+s}$. If, in addition, $u_1^{[t,t+s)} = u_2^{[t,t+s)}$ then $u_1^{t+s} \sim u_2^{t+s}$.*

Proof. The first part of the statement follows directly from item (i) of Definition A.3. To prove the second part, let us consider a prolongation $\tilde{u}_1$ of u_1^{t+s}. Obviously, $\tilde{u}_1$ is also a prolongation of u_1^t. Because $u_2^t \sim u_1^t$, there exists a prolongation $\tilde{u}_2$ of u_2^t, such that $\tilde{u}_2^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{u}_1^{[t,\infty)}$, and $\tilde{y}_2^{[t,\infty)} = \tilde{y}_1^{[t,\infty)}$. This proves the lemma, because $\tilde{u}_2^{[t,t+s)} = u_1^{[t,t+s)} = u_2^{[t,t+s)}$ and hence $\tilde{u}_2$ is a prolongation of u_2^{t+s}. □

Proof of Proposition A.2. From (A.1), we have $x(t) = \Gamma(u^t)$, $x(t+s) = \Gamma(u^{t+s}) = \Gamma(u^t \vee u^{[t,t+s)})$. Due to Lemma A.3, for any $v^t \sim u^t$, such that $v^{[t,t+s)} = u^{[t,t+s)}$, it holds $v^{t+s} \sim u^{t+s}$, and we can conclude that $\Gamma(u^t \vee u^{[t,t+s)})$ depends on $\Gamma(u^t)$, but not on u^t directly, thus we can express $x(t+s)$ according to (A.2). □

Proposition A.3. *The state transition function comply with the* semi-group property

$$\phi\left(x(t), u^{[t,t+s)}\right) = \phi\left(\phi\left(x(t), u^{[t,t+s')}\right), u^{[t+s',t+s)}\right),\ s \geq s' \geq 0. \tag{A.3}$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition A.2 we have

$$x(t+s') = \Gamma(u^t \vee u^{[t,t+s')}) = \phi\left(x(t), u^{[t,t+s')}\right),$$
$$\Gamma(u^t \vee u^{[t,t+s)}) = \phi\left(x(t), u^{[t,t+s)}\right),$$
$$\Gamma(u^{t+s'} \vee u^{[t+s',t+s)}) = \phi\left(x(t+s'), u^{[t+s',t+s)}\right).$$

Because $u^t \vee u^{[t,t+s)} = u^{t+s'} \vee u^{[t+s',t+s)}$, the above equations give (A.3). □

Lemma A.4. *Let $u_1^t, u_2^t \in x(t)$, $y_1 = F[u_1]$, $y_2 = F[u_2]$. If $u_1(t) = u_2(t)$ then $y_1(t) = y_2(t)$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{u}_2$ be a prolongation of u_2^t, such that $\tilde{u}_2^{[t,\infty)} = u_1^{[t,\infty)}$. It exists, because $u_1(t) \sim u_2(t)$, and $\tilde{y}_2^{[t,\infty)} = y_1^{[t,\infty)}$ holds true. Thus, $y_1(t) = \tilde{y_2}(t)$. Because $\tilde{u}_2(t) = u_1(t)$, and $u_2(t) = u_1(t)$, we have $\tilde{u}_2^{(-\infty,t]} = u_2^{(-\infty,t]}$. According to item (ii) of Definition A.1, from $\tilde{u}_2^{(-\infty,t]} = u_2^{(-\infty,t]}$ follows $\tilde{y}_2^{(-\infty,t]} = y_2^{(-\infty,t]}$. Hence, $y_2(t) = \tilde{y}_2(t)$. □

Proposition A.4. *For any $u \in \mathcal{U}$ the output $y(t)$ is determined by the state $x(t)$ and the output value $u(t)$,*

$$y(t) = f(x(t), u(t)). \tag{A.4}$$

Proof. Because the system is deterministic, the output $y^{(-\infty,t]}$ depends only on $u^{(-\infty,t]} = u^t \vee u(t)$. According to Lemma A.4, $y(t)$ depends on $x(t)$, but not on $u^t \in x(t)$ directly. Thus, (A.4) holds true. □

Proposition A.4 can be strengthened assuming that the inputs are continuous functions of time.

Proposition A.5. *Let U be a metric space and all inputs $u \in \mathcal{U}$ be continuous functions of time. Then from $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$ follows that $u_1(t) = u_2(t)$, and*

$$y(t) = f(x(t)),\ u(t) = g(x(t)). \tag{A.5}$$

Proof. Because $\lim\limits_{t' \to t} u^t(t') = u(t)$, the inequality $u_1(t) \neq u_2(t)$ and the equivalence $u_1^t \sim u_2^t$ contradict each other, due to item (i) of Definition A.3. Thus, for all $u^t \in x(t)$ the value $u(t)$ must be the same, which proves the proposition. □